

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 087823
ORIGIN LAB-04

INFO OCT-01 ARA-10 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-04 H-02
INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-02 PRS-01 SP-02
SS-15 COME-00 EB-08 SIL-01 OMB-01 TRSE-00 USIE-00
INRE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 /066 R

DRAFTED BY LABOR:ILAB:DLAZORCHICK
APPROVED BY ARA/MEX/STATE:GFALK
STATE:/ARA/RPP/TWALSH
ARA/MEX/STATE:DREYFUSS
USIA: EMCHALE

-----192314Z 015375 /63

O 192100Z APR 77
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY MEXICO IMMEDIATE

UNCLAS STATE 087823

ATTENTION: LABOR ATTACHE NIXON AND PAO BALDGA

E.O. 11652:

TAGS: MX

SUBJECT: BACKGROUND PAPER ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN
THE UNITED STATES

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND U.S. POLICY

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONSISTS OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN UNIONS AND MANAGEMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF REGULATING THE RELATIONS BETWEEN MANAGEMENT AND WORKERS. THE CORNERSTONE OF U.S. GOVERNMENT POLICY WITH RESPECT TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IS THE PHILOSOPHY THAT LABOR AND MANAGEMENT SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO WORK OUT THEIR OWN PROBLEMS AND ARRIVE AT A VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT CON-
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 087823

CERNING THEM. THIS PHILOSOPHY HAS ENABLED THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS TO ALLOW THE FLEXIBILITY NEEDED BY MANAGEMENT AND LABOR TO ADAPT TO A CHANGING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT.

THE COURTS AND EARLY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PHILOSOPHY

PRIOR TO THE ENACTMENT OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT IN 1926 AND THE NORRIS-LA GUARDIA ACT IN 1932 THE GOVERNMENT'S INVOLVEMENT IN LABOR RELATIONS WAS, FOR THE MOST

PART, A PRODUCT OF COURT DECISIONS. THEIR DECISIONS

REPRESENTED THE ONLY GOVERNMENTAL MEASURES AVAILABLE AND WERE BASED ON A LONG HISTORY OF COMMON LAW. ONE OF THE EARLIEST COURT DECISIONS WAS COMMONWEALTH V. PULLIS (1806), FROM WHICH EVOLVED THE LEGAL DOCTRINE THAT WORKERS ACTING IN CONCERT TO RAISE WAGES WERE INVOLVED IN A CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY UNDER COMMON LAW. THE CONSPIRACY DOCTRINE WAS MODIFIED BY THE 1842 DECISION OF COMMONWEALTH V. HUNT. IN THE OPINION OF THE COURT, "...A CONSPIRACY MUST BE A COMBINATION OF TWO OR MORE PERSONS, BY SOME CONCERTED ACTION, TO ACCOMPLISH SOME CRIMINAL OR UNLAWFUL MEANS." THE COURT NOTED THAT THE POWER OF A LABOR ORGANIZATION COULD BE USED FOR BOTH HONORABLE AND PERNICIOUS PURPOSES, AND THE DOCTRINE THAT THE ACTIONS OF A LABOR COMBINATION WERE ILLEGAL PER SE WAS EXPLICITLY REJECTED. THIS MODIFICATION OF THE CONSPIRACY DOCTRINE WAS GRADUALLY ADOPTED BY OTHER COURTS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY. OF SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE, THOUGH, IN THIS CASE, AND THE EARLIER COMMONWEALTH V. PULLIS, IS THE FACT THAT PRECEDENT HAD BEEN ESTABLISHED FOR EMPLOYERS TO RELY ON THE COURTS TO RESTRAIN UNIONS. UNTIL THE EARLY 1930'S THE INJUNCTION WAS A WIDELY USED INSTRUMENT FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF CERTAIN UNION ACTIVITIES SUCH AS STRIKES, PICKETING AND BOYCOTTS. INJUNCTIVE UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 087823

RELIEF WAS AVAILABLE BASED ON THE FACT THAT SUCH ACTIVITIES TENDED TO BE ACCOMPANIED BY VIOLENCE OR OTHER UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND THE LEGISLATURE

CURRENTLY, THE MOST IMPORTANT SOURCES OF LABOR RELATIONS LAW AND THUS GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS COMES FROM THE U.S. CONGRESS. THE MAJOR LABOR LEGISLATION IN THE U.S. IS EMBODIED IN THE FOLLOWING LAWS; (1) THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT OF 1926, AS AMENDED; (2) THE NORRIS - LA GUARDIA ACT OF 1932; (3) THE WAGNER ACT OF 1935; (4) THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED; AND (5) THE LANDRUM-GRIFFIN ACT OF 1959, AS AMENDED.

THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT, PASSED IN 1926, SET FORTH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCEDURES FOR RAILROADS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES AS WELL AS PROVIDING FOR "EMERGENCY PROCEDURES" TO COPE WITH STRIKES WHICH THREATENED TO SUBSTANTIALLY INTERRUPT INTERSTATE COMMERCE. BY

1936, WITH THE GROWTH OF THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY, THE ACT WAS AMENDED AND EXTENDED TO INCLUDE AIRLINE CARRIERS.

UNLIKE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, THERE ARE NO SET CONTRACT DURATIONS UNDER THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT. INSTEAD, CONTRACTS CONTAIN "MORATORIUM DATES" OR "AMENDABLE DATES," WHEN SUCH AGREEMENTS ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE. DEMANDS BY UNIONS AND CARRIERS ARE EXPRESSED IN "SECTION SIX" NOTICES WHICH ARE DECLARATIONS OF INTENTIONS TO CHANGE THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT. A "STATUS QUO" PERIOD PROHIBITS CHANGES IN THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT, UNTIL THE PARTIES

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 087823

REACH AGREEMENT OR ALL REQUIRED PROCEDURES OF THE ACT HAVE BEEN EXHAUSTED. IF THE PARTIES CANNOT REACH AGREEMENT IN DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS, THEN ONE OR BOTH PARTIES MAY REQUEST THE MEDIATORY ASSISTANCE OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD.

IF MEDIATION IS UNSUCCESSFUL UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD, THEN THE NMB, AS ONE OF ITS LAST FORMAL OBLIGATIONS, REQUESTS THE PARTIES TO SUBMIT THEIR DISPUTE TO BINDING ARBITRATION. IF EITHER PARTY REFUSES ARBITRATION, THE BOARD MUST FORMALLY NOTIFY BOTH PARTIES OF ITS FAILURE TO RECONCILE THEIR DIFFERENCES. A 30-DAY "STATUS QUO" PERIOD IS INSTITUTED AT THIS POINT AND DURING THIS TIME, THE NMB CAN RECOMMEND TO THE PRESIDENT THAT AN EMERGENCY BOARD BE ESTABLISHED. IF AN EMERGENCY BOARD IS NOW WARRANTED, THEN AT THE EXPIRATION OF THE 30-DAY PERIOD, THE UNION IS FREE TO STRIKE AND THE CARRIER IS FREE TO LOCK OUT ITS EMPLOYEES.

UNDER SECTION 10 OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT, IF A DISPUTE BETWEEN A CARRIER AND ITS EMPLOYEES THREATENS SUBSTANTIALLY TO INTERRUPT INTERSTATE COMMERCE TO A DEGREE SUCH AS TO DEPRIVE ANY SECTION OF THE COUNTRY OF ESSENTIAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICES, THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD SHALL NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT, WHO MAY, IN HIS DISCRETION CREATE A BOARD TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON THE DISPUTE.

WHEN THE EXECUTIVE ORDER CREATING THE BOARD IS ISSUED, THEN ANOTHER 60-DAY "STATUS QUO" PERIOD BEGINS. THE PRESIDENT THEN USUALLY APPOINTS THREE PROMINENT LABOR RELATIONS NEUTRALS TO INVESTIGATE AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE DISPUTE. THE EMERGENCY BOARD MEMBERS THEN CONDUCT HEARINGS WITH THE

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 087823

PARTIES AND INVESTIGATE THE FACTS CONCERNING THE DISPUTE. THE EMERGENCY BOARD MUST MAKE A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT 30 DAYS AFTER CREATION OF THE BOARD. THE REPORT USUALLY CONTAINS FACTS REGARDING THE CASE AS WELL AS RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO THE SETTLEMENT TERMS. THE PARTIES ARE THEN REQUIRED TO NEGOTIATE BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EMERGENCY BOARD FOR 30 DAYS AFTER THE REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT IS DELIVERED. IF NO AGREEMENT IS CONCLUDED BY THE END OF THE SECOND 30-DAY PERIOD, THE PARTIES ARE THEN FREE TO RESORT TO SELF HELP.

SINCE THE PASSAGE OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT, SOME 287 EMERGENCY BOARDS HAVE BEEN APPOINTED. THE FACT THAT THE PRINCIPAL RAILROADS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES NOW NEGOTIATE NATIONAL CONTRACTS WITH THEIR UNIONS, MAKES EMERGENCY BOARD PROCEDURES AN IMPORTANT PART OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, AND WITH FEW EXCEPTIONS, THE PARTIES TO DISPUTES INVESTIGATED BY EMERGENCY BOARDS HAVE ACCEPTED THE BASIS OF THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUBSEQUENT RESOLUTION OF THEIR DISPUTES.

THE NORRIS LA-GUARDIA ACT

THE LOGIC OF THE NORRIS-LA GUARDIA ACT IS TO AFFIRM A LAISSEZ-FAIRE PHILOSOPHY IN SPECIFYING THAT GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT IMPOSE CONSTRAINTS UPON THE CONDUCT OF THE UNION-MANAGEMENT RELATIONSHIP OR INTERFERE WITH IT IN ANY WAY, UNLESS THERE HAS BEEN ACTUAL VIOLENCE OR DAMAGE TO TANGIBLE PROPERTY. THE ACT DOES NOT PROHIBIT THE USE OF THE INJUNCTION IN ALL LABOR DISPUTES BUT IT DOES LIMIT THE SCOPE OF THE INJUNCTION AS APPLIED AND PRESCRIBES DEFINITE PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW WHEN AN INJUNCTION IS USED. THE ACT ALSO OUTLAWED THE USE OF THE "YELLOW DOG" CONTRACT. ALTHOUGH GENERALLY CONCEDED TO BE A MODEST PIECE OF UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 087823

LEGISLATION THE NORRIS-LA GUARDIA ACT DID STATE A NEW U.S. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIPS AND FREEDOM OF CONTRACT STATING:

...THE INDIVIDUAL UNORGANIZED WORKER IS COMMONLY HELPLESS TO EXERCISE ACTUAL LIBERTY OF CONTRACT AND TO PROTECT HIS FREEDOM OF LABOR...THOUGH HE SHOULD BE FREE TO DECLINE TO ASSOCIATE WITH HIS FELLOWS, IT IS NECESSARY THAT HE HAVE FULL FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION, SELF-ORGANIZATION, AND DESIGNATION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HIS OWN CHOOSING, TO NEGOTIATE THE TERMS AND

CONDITIONS OF HIS EMPLOYMENT AND THAT HE SHALL BE FREE FROM INTERFERENCE, RESTRAINT, OR COERCION OF EMPLOYERS OF LABOR...

WAGNER ACT OF 1935

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1935 (WAGNER ACT) CAN BE ENUMERATED AS FOLLOWS:

(1) EMPLOYEES HAVE THE RIGHT TO DECIDE WHETHER THEY WANT A UNION ORGANIZATION; (2) EMPLOYEES ARE TO SELECT THEIR OWN BARGAINING REPRESENTATIVES; (3) EMPLOYERS ARE NOT TO INTERFERE WITH THE FREE EXERCISE OF THESE RIGHTS BY EMPLOYEES; (4) EMPLOYERS MUST RECOGNIZE AND DEAL WITH THE REPRESENTATIVES SELECTED BY THEIR EMPLOYEES. SECTIONS 7 AND 8 ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT.

THE ACT CREATED A THREE-MAN NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD TO BE APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE. THE BOARD NOW CONTAINS FIVE MEMBERS WHO SERVE A TERM OF FIVE YEARS. THEIR FUNCTIONS ARE:

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 07 STATE 087823

(1) PREVENT UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES BY BOTH EMPLOYERS AND UNIONS; (2) CONDUCT REPRESENTATIVE PROCEEDINGS; (3) SECURE ENFORCEMENT OR REVIEW OF ITS ORDERS BY FEDERAL COURTS IN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CASES; (4) CONDUCT A POLL AMONG EMPLOYEES ABOUT THE ENGAGE IN A NATIONAL EMERGENCY STRIKE; (5) SETTLE JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES BETWEEN RIVAL UNIONS; (6) SECURE INJUNCTIONS AGAINST UNIONS AND EMPLOYERS FOR UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES AND (7) OBTAIN SECURITY INJUNCTIONS TO STOP CERTAIN STRIKES AND BOYCOTTS FORBIDDEN BY SECTION 8(B)(4).

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT OF 1947

THIS ACT AMENDED THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT AND BECAME EFFECTIVE IN AUGUST, 1947. IT ENLARGED THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FROM THREE TO FIVE MEMBERS AND CREATED THE NEW OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE BOARD. THE GENERAL COUNSEL HAS FINAL AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE UNFAIR PRACTICE CHARGES AND ISSUE COMPLAINTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STIPULATIONS OF SECTION 10 OF THE ACT. SECTION 8 OF THE ACT REPEATS

THE WAGENER ACT, EXCEPT THAT EMPLOYERS MAY NO LONGER LEGALLY AGREE TO CLOSED SHOP ARRANGEMENTS. SECTION 8(B) ADDS A LIST OF UNFAIR PRACTICES FOR LABOR UNIONS

OR THEIR AGENTS.

UNDER THE ACT THERE ARE FOUR MAJOR AREAS IN WHICH MANAGEMENT WAS GIVEN GREATER FREEDOM TO ACT. (1) THE LAW REMOVED SUPERVISORS AND FOREMEN FROM COVERAGE; (2) THE LAW INCLUDED IN SECTION 8(C) WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED A FREE SPEECH AMENDMENT; (3) THE LAW GAVE EMPLOYERS THE RIGHT TO SEEK AN ELECTION WHENEVER ANY UNION MADE A CLAIM FOR RECOGNITION AS A BARGAINING AGENT FOR THE COMPANY'S EMPLOYEES; AND (4)
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 08 STATE 087823

EMPLOYERS WERE GIVEN THE RIGHT UNDER SECTION 301(A) TO SUE UNIONS IN THE COURTS FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT.

SOME CONSTRAINTS ON MANAGEMENT WERE: (1) SIXTY DAYS NOTICE MUST BE GIVEN TO THE OTHER PARTY PRIOR TO ANY TERMINATION OR CHANGE IN A CONTRACT, AND THIRTY DAYS NOTICE MUST BE GIVEN TO THE MEDIATION AGENCY IN THE STATE.

THE LAW MAKES BOTH UNIONS AND EMPLOYERS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACTS OF THEIR AGENTS, MAKES UNIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES, AND SETS UP CERTAIN SAFEGUARDS WITH RESPECT TO UNION SECURITY AGREEMENTS AND THE "CHECK OFF." IT PROVIDES, THROUGH THE FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE, FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE IN SETTLING LABOR DISPUTES; AND IT EMPOWERS THE GOVERNMENT TO TAKE CERTAIN LIMITED STEPS TO AID IN RESOLVING LABOR DISPUTES WHERE A THREATENED OR ACTUAL STRIKE OR LOCK OUT WOULD IMPERIL NATIONAL HEALTH OR SAFETY.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY STRIKES

AS DEFINED IN THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT, A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DISPUTE HAS TWO ESSENTIAL FEATURES: (1) IT AFFECTS AN ENTIRE INDUSTRY OR A SUBSTANTIAL PART THEREOF AND (2) IT IMPERILS THE NATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY. IN SUCH A DISPUTE, THE PRESIDENT IS EMPOWERED TO APPOINT A BOARD OF INQUIRY TO ASCERTAIN THE CAUSES AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE DISPUTE. UPON RECEIPT OF THE REPORT OF THE BOARD OF INQUIRY, THE PRESIDENT MAY DIRECT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO PETITION

ANY DISTRICT COURT FOR AN 80-DAY INJUNCTION AGAINST THE STRIKE OR LOCK OUT. THE DISTRICT COURT WILL ISSUE THE INJUNCTION IF THE DISPUTE HAS BOTH OF THE FEATURES
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 09 STATE 087823

REQUIRED. THE BOARD OF INQUIRY IS RECONVENED WHEN THE INJUNCTION IS ISSUED. IF THE DISPUTE IS NOT SETTLED IN THE NEXT 60 DAYS, THE BOARD OF INQUIRY REPORTS THE POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES AND THE EMPLOYER'S LAST OFFER TO THE PRESIDENT WHO IN TURN MAKES THE REPORT PUBLIC. THE NLRB WITHIN THE NEXT 15 DAYS CONDUCTS A SECRET BALLOT OF THE EMPLOYEES INVOLVED TO DETERMINE IF THEY WISH TO ACCEPT THE EMPLOYER'S LAST OFFER. IF NO SETTLEMENT IS REACHED BY THE 80TH DAY, THE INJUNCTION IS DISCHARGED. THE PRESIDENT THEN REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS AND MAY RECOMMEND LEGISLATION TO DEAL WITH THE DISPUTE.

IT NEEDS TO BE EMPHASIZED HERE THAT AFTER THE 80-DAY INJUNCTION THE UNION IS FREE TO STRIKE AND THE MANAGEMENT IS FREE TO LOCK OUT. NEITHER THE PRESIDENT NOR THE BOARD OF INQUIRY IS EMPOWERED TO RECOMMEND TERMS OF SETTLEMENT. THE PROCEDURE CONSISTS OF AN 80-DAY COOLING-OFF PERIOD, EXTENSIVE PUBLICITY AS TO THE POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES (BUT NO OFFICIAL JUDGMENT OF THE PROPRIETY OF THOSE POSITIONS), AND THE PERMISSION FOR PRESIDENTIAL PETITION OF CONGRESS FOR AD HOC LEGISLATION IF ALL ELSE FAILS.

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN ACT OF 1959, AS AMENDED

THIS ACT EXTENDS THE TAFT-HARTLEY RESTRICTIONS BUT ALSO GOES BEYOND THIS BY GIVING THE UNION MEMBER PROTECTION AGAINST HIS OWN UNION. THE PURPOSES OF THE ACT ARE TO SAFEGUARD CIVIL RIGHTS OF UNION MEMBERS; PROVIDE FOR THE REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF UNIONS, EMPLOYERS, AND LABOR RELATIONS CONSULTANTS; REGULATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUSTEESHIP BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS; DELINEATE THE JURISDICTIONAL LINES BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE AUTHORITY IN THE AREA OF INDUSTRIAL UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 10 STATE 087823

RELATIONS; CLOSE LOOPHOLES IN THE RESTRICTIONS AGAINST SECONDARY BOYCOTTS; REGULATE ORGANIZATIONAL PICKETING; AND AMEND VARIOUS FEATURES OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT.

SUMMARY

U.S. GOVERNMENT POLICY CONTINUES TO PLACE THE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR ARRIVING AT THE TERMS OF

A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT ON LABOR AND MANAGEMENT WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATING TO THE MINIMUM EXTENT POSSIBLE. AS EVIDENCE OF THE EFFICACY OF THIS POLICY IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE

VAST MAJORITY OF ALL NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND MANAGEMENT ARE RESOLVED WITHOUT RESORT TO STRIKE ACTION. FOR THE PAST THREE DECADES (SINCE 1947) THERE HAS BEEN AN AVERAGE OF LESS THAN ONE-FOURTH OF ONE PERCENT OF THE WORKING TIME AVAILABLE LOST DUE TO LABOR RELATIONS DISPUTES.

DURING THAT SAME PERIOD THE MACHINERY DESIGNED TO SETTLE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DISPUTES UNDER THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT HAS BEEN USED ONLY 34 TIMES. THE FOLLOWING TABLE ILLUSTRATES THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DISPUTES BY YEAR.

YEAR	NUMBER OF DISPUTES	NUMBER OF WORKERS INVOLVED THOUSANDS
------	-----------------------	---

1947.....	476.0	
1948.....	7.....	337.0
1949.....	1.....	

1950		
1951.....	1.....	40.0

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 11 STATE 087823

1952.....	1.....	1.6
1953.....	1.....	30.0
1954.....	2.....	4.5

1955		
1956.....	1.....	60.0
1957.....	1.....	1.5
1958.....		
1959.....	2.....	571.0

1960		
1961.....	1.....	2.7
1962.....	4.....	83.8
1963.....	1.....	--
1964.....	1.....	

53.0

1965		
1966.....	3.....	17.8
1967.....	1.....	2.4
1968.....	1.....	50.0
1969		

1970		
1971.....	5.....	68.7
1972		
1973		

1974

1975

1976

SOURCE; BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 12 STATE 087823

OF THESE 34 EMERGENCY DISPUTES THERE HAVE BEEN ONLY
NINE STRIKES AFTER THE 80-DAY COOLING OFF PERIOD. EIGHT
OF THESE STRIKES WERE IN THE LONGSHORE-MARITIME INDUS-
TRY.

VANCE

UNCLASSIFIED

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 22-Sep-1999 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, POLICIES, REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 19-Apr-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977STATE087823
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: LABOR:ILAB:DLAZORCHICK
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: D770136-0095
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t197704103/baaaevsp.tel
Line Count: 452
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 96263e9c-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN LAB
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 10-Feb-2005 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2668894
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: BACKGROUND PAPER ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE UNITED STATES
TAGS: ELAB, MX, US
To: MEXICO
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/96263e9c-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009